DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 051 HE 012 278

AUTHOR Touhill, Blanche M.
TITLE Professional and Staff Development: Past Practice and Future Plans at UMSL.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 16p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Personnel; *College Faculty; College Role; Developmental Programs; Educational History; Educational Objectives; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Professional Development; Relationship; *State Universities
IDENTIFIERS *University of Missouri Saint Louis

ABSTRACT

When it opened in 1963, most of the University of Missouri at St. Louis faculty had little or no prior experience in higher education. Faculty and staff development during the first 15 years were based on: (1) individual goal setting; (2) learning where development opportunities existed for accomplishing those goals, the discipline to accomplish them, and then communicating to the university that they had been achieved; and (3) a realistic perspective on faculty responsibilities. The university has now clearly defined its mission, and the principles behind staff development remain the same. Specific development issues have surfaced: faculty must place greater emphasis on their work with students; staff members who obtain degrees want to move into middle management positions in the university and play an active role in governance, but do not seek faculty status; and the administration must institutionalize faculty and staff development to fulfill the mission of the university. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED183051

HE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Blanche M Touhill

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PROFESSIONAL AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT:

PAST PRACTICE AND FUTURE PLANS AT UMSL.

Blanche M. Touhill
Associate Vice Chancellor
for Academic Affairs
University of Missouri-
St. Louis

HE 012 278

Professional and Staff Development:
Past Practice and Future Plans at UMSL

The University of Missouri-St. Louis is one of four campuses of the University of Missouri system. The St. Louis campus was founded in 1963 in an effort to provide higher education at a reasonable cost for the citizens of the metropolitan St. Louis area. Most of the faculty and staff lack prior experience in higher education. In addition, the needs of an urban campus, whose student body lives at home, works twenty hours a week, comes from pluralistic cultural background, and views education not only as an intellectually enriching experience but as a means to becoming economically self-sufficient are rather different than the needs of a residential campus with a more traditional student body.

As a result of working on such an urban campus, both the faculty and staff at UMSL are caught in two main currents. The first current draws both faculty and staff to consider outside factors in planning their careers. Faculty are pulled into the mainstream of their particular profession and hence, realize that great amounts of time must be given to research in order to obtain national recognition. Similarly, the staff find themselves constantly attracted by the mainstream of economic opportunity available in the metropolitan St. Louis area.

The second current draws both faculty and staff to consider inside factors in planning their careers. In a new urban university faculty must give a great amount of time to teaching, service and extension. Staff are also caught in a demanding situation and while the work is exciting it is also unsettling since modes of behavior are still being created. For both groups the lack of bureaucracy creates opportunity, but at the same time members of both groups are uncertain as to what kind of behavior will result in reward.

* * *

A summary of the points made in the introduction are as follows:

1. The University of Missouri at St. Louis is only fifteen years old. By and large the faculty and staff lack prior experience. In addition, any "new" university demands immense service involvement on the part of the faculty and extra work effort on the part of the staff.

2. A young campus often has a problem of identity. During those early years, UMSL struggled with such questions as to whether it should concentrate on providing an excellent undergraduate educational experience or lay plans to develop into a limited comprehensive university.

Similarly, the students are different on an urban campus of a state university than on a rural campus. One of the major differences is UMSL has no dormitories. But in addition there is little school spirit, the students place great attention on obtaining a type of a degree which will result in a good job, and there is a minimum of faculty-student association.

3. Both faculty and staff were well aware of the two major currents, one inside the univeristy and one outside the university, pulling on them, demanding that they concentrate their efforts one way or the other.

4. With very little bureaucracy in place there appeared to be no clear outlines to follow which would result in reward but the freedom to act and to develop one's career was great.

* * *

The question which had to be raised and answered by every member of the UMSL faculty was how was he or she going to act in such an unusual setting which would result in good raises, steady development as a professional and ultimately tenure and promotion. Members of the staff had to raise

and answer similar types of questions. But the staff did not have as much difficulty answering those questions mainly because there were firm guidelines established outlining their reward system in the university-wide policy and procedure manual. Nevertheless, those individuals who did not raise and answer such questions, whether faculty or staff, were pulled by one current or the other and either did not survive or survive today in a condescending environment.

My point is that careers have to be taken seriously. The individual cannot rely on the institution to take care of them. The American society, particularly after World War II, has both national and local demands for the faculty, and regional and local demands for staff. The individual who has a career must analyze their personal goals, keeping in mind both currents.

* * *

The UMSL scene was further complicated by another factor. In the early days women faculty were excluded from service activities, except for the hospitality committee. There was an environment which made many of the women faculty believe the exclusion from service activities was the prelude to exclusion from satisfactory raises, tenure and promotion. It was necessary, therefore, for the women faculty to push forward onto committees in order to play an equal role with their counterpart male colleagues. But in doing so immense amounts of their time were taken up in activity for which the only reward was the intangible "faculty status."

Those of us who were involved in the early decision to push each other forward for committee assignments recognized the price we were going to pay, but concluded there was no choice. The reason this was

such an important decision was there were so few of us. To get women onto the major committees meant that all of us had to overextend ourselves, at least, in the first few years. Within eight years, however, there was no question that women faculty had attained "faculty status." Women faculty were on every major committee and a woman was elected Chairperson of the University Senate in 1973-74, primarily as a result of prior committee involvement. Out of nineteen departments four women were serving as Chairperson. There was still only one woman who had attained the rank of full professor, but sixteen women had obtained tenure and promotion to associate professor.

* * *

In tracing the historical development of past practice in professional and staff development at UMSL I would like to next outline the requirements demanded of all faculty; i.e., involvement in service, teaching, and research.

Service

The service demands were incredibly great. The St. Louis campus of the University of Missouri began when the University of Missouri bought an old country club located on the city-county line and announced to the citizens of the Metropolitan St. Louis area that reasonably priced higher education had finally come to St. Louis. Faculty Committees not only had to concern themselves with academic matters but they had to provide the expertise to help plan buildings, etc., as well as develop procedures under which the student community would function. Many faculty were literally engulfed by committee service. A faculty member who kept his or her balance and perspecitve served on two committees every year; i.e., a local departmental committee and either a college committee, a campus committee, or a university

system committee. A part of professional development is service, and peer friendships and/or connections are important. Faculty who refused additional committee assignments, over and above those outlined above, with a written statement of current professional responsibilities, did not become overloaded.

Teaching

Teaching in the first few years was considered to be the primary activity. The founding fathers really envisioned building a liberal arts college, small in enrollment, with low faculty student ratios, concentrating on excellent teaching, emphasizing independent study and seminar activities.

Education and Business degrees would be offered, but neither programs were to become too large, and were basically to be controlled by the Arts and Science faculty. As a result of those plans summer grants were initially made available for curriculum development. In addition, the school was so small and intimate, that faculty who were not good teachers felt uncomfortable and tended to leave.

However, the dreams of the founding fathers did not last long simply because the citizens of the metropolitan area came in droves to obtain a reasonably priced university education. The following summary of enrollments explained what happened: Fall, 1963-672; 1965-4,658; 1967-6,558; 1969-9,598; 1971-10,188; 1973-11,589; 1975-11,843; 1977-11,374. [1]

With such enrollment pressures additional faculty had to be recruited. Adequate funding was available and an excellent young faculty was hired. Many of the new faculty had several job opportunities. They came to UMSL because they believed the campus would very shortly be adding graduate programs. They concentrated on research activity over teaching. That

concentration, plus the press of student numbers, resulted in the coup de gras for the original dream of the founding fathers to build an excellent undergraduate school, concentrating on good teaching. The destruction of the original dream opened the door to the problem of identity.

Research

Research rose to become the primary factor in tenure and promotion. Teaching moved to a secondary position.

Previous summer grants earmarked for curriculum development were awarded to research activities. The local deans attempted to save the teaching effort from total annilation by announcing that while tenure and promotion were primarily to be dependent on research activity, annual raises were to be primarily dependent on teaching effectiveness. Teaching evaluations did not have to be made but without them the annual raise would be in jeopardy. Departments, Schools or Colleges began to develop teaching evaluation instruments almost immediately.

Efforts to develop research interests were paramount. Every faculty person automatically received funding to attend one national meeting. In addition, inclusion on a program merited funding for other meetings. National meetings were of great importance. Papers, read at such meetings, were placed on vitaes and counted at both raise and/or tenure and promotion time. In addition, repeated attendance at annual meetings resulted in "national recognition" and like university committee service, peer friendships and/or connections proved to be exceedingly valuable. National meetings were considered to be important mainly because they were a sourse of obtaining information valuable for research. The faculty member had to fully comprehend current national trends in their field in order to engage in research. They had to get peer comments on their work.

They had to know about grant and publishing opportunities. One other important comment should be made; i.e., UMSL suffered from being new, from being referred to as the branch campus of the State University, and faculty who were nationally known were more highly respected among their colleagues on the home campus.

UMSL made several other decisions in its early days to stimulate research activity. In addition to summer research grants, small annual grant funds were made available during the academic year. In addition each school or college employed a part-time typist whose job was to type the faculty members' research; i.e., monographs, texts, articles, papers, book reviews, etc. The services of the print shop were also available, as long as the faculty member was prepared to pay for the service.

Extension

One final comments on those early days. The University of Missouri is a Land Grant Institution and hence the Extension Division had always played a large role in its activities. When the university established the St. Louis campus the Extension Division had an office on the St. Louis campus, but no one envisioned them having a major role on the development of the campus. But slowly faculty realized the importance of Extension in opening doors for research projects in City Government or practicum experiences in social agencies, etc. The problem of identity, however, had not yet been solved. Many faculty hired in the first few years still clung to the belief they were building an excellent undergraduate educational institution. They still maintained the vision of an intimate small undergraduate school secluded on 120 acres of rolling hills, near an urban area but not a part of it. Extension activities had no place in that kind of vision because it had no relevance. Extension's time was still to come.

* * *

Towards the end of the 70's the identity problem became acute. One group of the faculty were still concentrating on excellence in teaching while the new group were busy concentrating on research. And finally there were those who concentrated on service; i.e., on administratively helping to build the university. If there was one factor which helped the researchers it was that the students simply did not spend much time on campus. The students were not interested in seeking out faculty to form out-of-class associations. The faculty did have an immense amount of time to use as they pleased. There was absolute freedome to spend one's time as one chose. The growing university had demands but how a faculty member responded to those demands was his or her business. The university did not have an organized system of faculty development mainly because the goals were still unclear. Communication and discipline became a key part of development and survival. Faculty development opportunities existed but they were not well publicized. For example, a faculty member who finally learned about the availability of the research typist was careful with whom that information was shared.

* * *

Opportunities were available for development in teaching, service, research and extension and those faculty who learned about and took advantage of those opportunities have survived and thrived. Those faculty followed the idea of the Aristotlian "Golden Mean." They served on committees, published, became nationally known in their field and did the necessary teaching. In other words, they did those things necessary for peer acceptance and recognition. They were able to move in both the national and local currents. But the survival rate particularly among the

early faculty was not great. The following chart lists the number of faculty employed from 1963 through 1969 and the number retained as of today.

Year	No. of faculty employed	No. of faculty retained
1963	32	3
1964	53	5
1965	107	12
1966	164	27
1967	203	21
1968	312	42
1969	349	32

It should be noted that some of the faculty left to obtain better positions but a greater percentage left to find institutions truly interested in teaching and/or service activities. Two other comments should be made. Of the five women hired, in rank, in 1965 one left because she was primarily interested in research at the time the institution was primarily interested in teaching. The remaining four were tenured, and one has subsequently retired. In addition faculty who wished, had numerous opportunities to enter the field of administration and did. Women faculty, in particular, have done so and several are ready to become Deans and Provosts.

* * *

Staff development in the first fifteen years took two major forms. Secretaries who were employed, from the beginning, generally rose to become the senior secretaries or administrative assistants in the respective schools or colleges. Some of the staff took advantage of the 75% discont on courses and the released time component built into the work day which allowed them to go to school and obtain a degree. The latter group then left the university after obtaining a degree to obtain a better

position in the community. The UMSL Personnel Office has always had a department concentrating on staff training, but by and large, it has not had the effect that the other two paths outlined above have had in developing staff.

* * *

In general, then, as far as past practice is concerned, both faculty and staff during the first fiteen years had ample opportunity to develop and to rise rapidly if the individual realized the importance of balance and perspective as a way of obtaining credibility. The most important prerequisite for developing balance and perspective was goal setting. The two most important aspects of maintaining balance and perspective were discipline and communication.

Therefore, faculty and staff development during the first fifteen years at UMSL were based on the following:

1. Goal setting

2. Communication: Learning where the opportunities for development existed which were necessary to accomplish one's goals.

Discipline: The organization of time and energy necessary to accomplish the goal.

Communication: Imforming the univeristy community of what had be accomplished.

3. Balance and Perspective: The recognition that university responsibilities are varied and complex and that the responsibilities with greater weight merit greater attention. The view one has of oneself in relation to the university must, in most instances, relate to the view the university has of the individual.

* * *

The principles outlined above, which were followed by faculty and staff, during the first fifteen years of the existence of the University of Missouri at St. Louis merited rewards. Those same principles are valid as UMSL enters its next fifteen year period, although the institution is entirely changed.

* * *

UMSL has now clearly defined its mission, It is determined to become a limited comprehensive university. It is determined to serve the citizenry of the Metropolitan St. Louis area and is actively involved, particularly through the Extension Division, in problem solving projects cutting across all lines of the society. Faculty service has expanded beyond the walls of the campus. UMSL is also determined to maintain quality education. It is now in the mainstream of the American Higher Education scene and it is determined to remain there. There is no debate as to whether one should concentrate on the national or local scene. They have become synonomous.

A Coordinating Council for Planning has been working for approximately one year to set guidelines for the next fifteen years. The Council established the following task forces: Instruction and Research; Community Service; Student Development and Student Services; Faculty, Administrators, and Staff Development; Instructional Resources and Technology; Physical Facilities; Fiscal Development; Campus, Inter-Campus, and Station Relations; Relations with St. Louis Area Educational Institutions, and Community Relations.

The Task Force on Faculty, Administrators, and Staff Development has just recently made their report.[2] If there are any over-all conclusions which can be made regarding these reports they are as follows.

1. Faculty realize they must place greater attention on their work with students.

2. Staff, who obtain degrees, want to move into middle management positions in the university. They also want to play a role in the governance structure of the university. They do not want "faculty status" but they do want recognized "university community status."

3. The Administration must institutionalize Faculty and Staff Development to mesh with the mission of the university.

It is facinating to realize that the vision of the founding fathers was to build a small university of excellence staffed by faculty "intent" on teaching. That vision was destroyed by the needs of the citizenry. Faculty who got confused as to how to develop their careers in such a changing environment have left the university.

The current vision of the UMSL university community is to develop a limited comprehensive university. It is still unknown whether the citizens of the Metropolitan St. Louis area as well as the citizens of the State of Missouri will support such an undertaking. A second confusion in mission may develop. But UMSL contends this time they are in tune with the residents of the Metropolitan area as well as the State. It is true that the numbers of traditional white male college students who are between 18 and 21 years old are declining. But UMSL is located in a Metropolitan area, with educational opportunities available to groups of citizens previously not enrolled in higher education; i.e., minorities, women and adults. Our student population among those groups growing. In addition while our full-time student body is declining the number of part-time students are growing. The UMSL Community does believe the development of a limited comprehensive university will be able to serve the needs of the local community and receive the support of the residents of the State.

Nevertheless the wise member of a university community, whether they are faculty or staff, should take his or her career seriously. They should be aware of both inside and outside currents. They should set goals, recognize the importance of communication and discipline, and maintain balance and perspective, in order to get the most out of their careers.

Attachment 1

UMSL ENROLLMENTS

Fall	1963 --	672
Winter	1964 --	784
Summer	1964 --	516
Fall	1964 --	2,650
Winter	1965 --	2,757
Summer	1965 --	1,792
Fall	1965 --	4,658
Winter	1966 --	4,398
Summer	1966 --	2,809
Fall	1966 --	5,803
Winter	1967 --	5,360
Summer	1967 --	3,154
Fall	1967 --	6,558
Winter	1968 --	6,110
Summer	1968 --	4,387
Fall	1968 --	8,240
Winter	1969 --	8,082
Summer	1969 --	5,427
Fall	1969 --	9,598
Winter	1970 --	9,076
Summer	1970 --	5,179
Fall	1970 --	9,681
Winter	1971 --	9,285
Summer	1971 --	5,251
Fall	1971 --	10,188
Winter	1972 --	9,750
Summer	1972 --	5,106
Fall	1972 --	11,155
Winter	1973 --	10,724
Summer	1973 --	5,314
Fall	1973 --	11,589
Winter	1974 --	10,959
Summer	1974 --	5,118
Fall	1974 --	11,394
Winter	1975 --	10,975
Summer	1975 --	5,401
Fall	1975 --	11,843
Winter	1976 --	11,211
Summer	1976 --	5,089
Fall	1976 --	11,188
Winter	1977 --	10,668
Summer	1977 --	4,923
Fall	1977 --	11,374
Winter	1978 --	10,574
Summer	1978 --	4,836